

LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICH.  
MAY 17 1909

# THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879

VOL II

NEW YORK, MAY 15, 1909

No 27

In accordance with the policy of this Journal I take pleasure in calling the attention of our readers to Professor Laing's reply to my strictures on his *Phormio*, printed in another column. In order to make clear some of my points I reprint, as a specimen of the work, his commentary on the first scene.

Amicus summus meus et popularis Geta  
Heri ad me uenit. erat ei de ratiuncula  
Iam pridem apud me relicuom pauxillulum  
Nummorum: id ut conficerem. confeci: adfero.  
Nam erilem filium eius duxisse audio  
Vxorem: ei, credo, munus hoc conraditur.  
Quam inique comparatumst, ei, qui minus habent,  
Vt semper aliquid addant ditioribus!  
Quod ille unciatim vix de demenso suo  
Suom defrudans genium conpersit miser,  
Id illa uniuersum abripit haud existumans,  
Quanto labore partum. porro autem Geta  
Feriatur alio munere, ubi era pepererit;  
Porro autem alio, ubi erit puero natalis dies;  
Vbi initiabunt. omne hoc mater auferet;  
Puer causa erit mittundi. sed uideon Getam?

35. summus, "most intimate".—popularis, "fellow-countryman". 36. de ratiuncula, "of a petty account". 37. relicuom, adjective. This is always a word of four syllables in Plautus and Terence.—pauxillulum, substantive, "a trifle". 38. id ut conficerem, "(he asked me) to get it together". 39. erilem, "his master's".—duxisse uxorem, "has taken a wife". 40. ei, "for her". 41. comparatumst, "it has been ordained".—ei, "those". 43. Scan quod ille unciatim, Iambic law. See Introduction xii.—demenso, "allowance". 44. suom genium, "his own self". The identification of a person and his genius is frequent.—defrudans = *defraudans*.—conpersit, "has saved up", from *conperco* (conparco). 46. partum, sc. *sit*.—porro autem, "then again". 47. ferietur alio munere, "will be struck for another present", lit., "by", instrumental ablative. 48. natalis dies, "birthday". 49. initiabunt, "will initiate (him)", i. e. into some form of religious mysteries. 50. uideon=*videone*.

Professor Laing objects to my intimation that the book required two weeks, or even less, to prepare on the ground that not the length of time should be considered, but whether the book meets the objects for which it is designed. His position is only partly correct. When a book is presented to the public bearing on its title page the words, "edited for the use of college students", we have a right to inquire whether the edition shows any evidences of care and elaboration in its preparation which would warrant its approval, and, if it seems to be a slim, hasty performance, it is perfectly justifiable to make that the basis of criti-

cism. If this edition had been designed principally for sight translation as is Nicholson's edition of the *Phormio* or Cowles's edition of the *Andria*, or Barber's edition of the *Captivi*, we should have known what to expect; the latter two books contain about the same kind and amount of commentary as does the edition under discussion. In many of our colleges Terence is not read until the junior year. Professor Laing, in his reply, states that this book is written for freshman students; this is not indicated in the book itself. Mr. Nicholson's edition is likewise intended for freshman students at Harvard. It gives no commentary at all.

But the main point of my remarks is more concerned with the other part of Professor Laing's reply.

Terence is one of the easier Latin authors; he is much easier than Vergil, than Cicero, or than Caesar. A glance at the specimen of the commentary given above will convince any one who has had experience in secondary teaching that the High School pupil who could not read Terence at the close of the second year in the High School with the assistance here given would be regarded as unusually stupid. If the freshman student needs this kind of assistance it is evident that the last two years of his High School work in Latin have been wasted. If Professor Laing wishes to improve the teaching of the Classics in this country he will not do it by lowering his freshman work to the level of the third year of the High School, but will do more good by intelligent efforts so to better the instruction in the schools that such an edition as the one he has prepared would be entirely superfluous.

We may grant for the sake of the argument that a number of college editions are overloaded; we may also grant that a number of High School editions suffer from the same fault, but the judicial mean between an edition that gives too little and one that gives too much is certainly not attained by an edition that assumes no more knowledge on the part of a freshman student than should be assumed at the end of the second year in the High School.

This is the point, therefore, that we have before us: are we teachers of Latin prepared to admit that, after four years of study in the High School,

with from one-fourth to one-fifth of the whole time devoted to Latin, the student still needs the kind of assistance provided by this book? If we are prepared to admit this, does it not constitute the strongest indictment against our teaching of Latin that could be framed? And if we are prepared to admit this too, does it not follow of necessity that unless steps are taken to improve the situation we teachers of Latin are compromising our calling?

Professor Laing's second class of text books, he says, are those of the type of Furneaux's Annals of Tacitus and Tyrrell's correspondence of Cicero. I should like greatly to see books of this type published in the United States and what he says as to the possibility of such publications arising from the endowment of libraries and universities fills me with hope, though not with immediate expectation. At present I know of but a single elaborate edition of a classical author ('elaborate' in Professor Laing's definition) published in this country at the expense of any one other than the author himself. No doubt, however, Professor Laing knows that there is a school edition of Furneaux's Annals of Tacitus and that we thus have an exact example of what he desiderates. Those who believe in the justice of his contention are urged to examine the school edition of Furneaux and to compare it with this edition of the Phormio. G. L.

#### SLANG, ANCIENT AND MODERN<sup>1</sup>

Every student of the life and literature of any past age must many times have felt how very old are countless 'new' things that we do and say, or, if you will, how fresh and modern was much, not to say *all*, of the life of the ancients; and more than that, how trite it is getting to be—nay, how trite it has been for centuries upon centuries—to say that 'there is no new thing under the sun'. Our age, and doubtless every past age save one, would fain pride itself on its originality, yet the representations of to-day and of yesterday, from Kipling back to Bacchylides, from the Hebrew Preacher down to Shakespeare, endorse, in effect, the words of the jingle, that it is 'the same thing over again'. We are told that Tennyson believed that "nothing can be said which has not been said in some form or another before", and even these very words of his illustrate the truth of his belief, for are they not almost identical with the familiar verse from Terence (Eunuchus 41):

Nullumst iam dictum, quod non sit dictum prius.

Of course, generally it is simply ideas that have permanency, and it is in their phrasing that novelty chiefly comes in; yet not rarely ideas and words alike, at some one's touch, come from out of what our opponents like to call the *dead* languages once more undecayed to life. And it is of some of these

apparent resurrections from the dead that I should like to speak. I shall restrict myself, in general, to one side of the subject—slang words and phrases and colloquialisms such as were known to the ancients and are likewise known to us to-day in practically the same form.

It certainly gives us a comfortable feeling to know that *putidum* and *σαπρόν* were used colloquially long before they were made vulgar by being adopted into our vernacular, that the ancients were familiar with rousing speeches and 'smooth' plays, with the art and the phrase of 'striking' a man for a present, as well as with the apparently gentler but really quite as effective 'touching' one's father for money. All these phrases, I say, carry reassurance with them, especially since some of them, at least, were in their day not slang but highly respectable usages.

To the inventor and user of slang two fields have proved most productive in all ages and among almost all nations: love and drunkenness. The reason doubtless is that the intoxicated person, whether tippler or lover, offers an easy mark for all sorts of barbed metaphors, and sometimes himself, in his exhilarated state, is extremely successful in escaping from bald literalism, in which escape some one has declared the essence of slang to lie. In English we have expressions almost beyond number drawn from both fields, which need not perhaps be enumerated. A writer of half a century ago gives a list of thirty-six slangy English expressions meaning drunken (by a strange sort of irony the article in which the list occurs appeared in a magazine called *Household Words*!) and this list of his is far from complete or up-to-date. Doubtless the number could be very nearly doubled from the slang of the present time. Indeed some two or three hundred expressions of this same meaning are listed by Farmer and Henly in their elaborate dictionary of slang.

But what about the ancients? We are accustomed to say that the Greeks, at least, practised moderation in drinking as in other things, yet I have found very nearly forty words and phrases of theirs meaning 'intoxicated', only part, it is true, slang—and this number, incomplete as it obviously must be, seems a bit large for a people who believed in 'nothing too much'. Among these phrases may be mentioned one from Archilochus (Frag. 74. Hiller-Crusius), who declares that he 'knows how to raise the beautiful strain, the dithyramb, when his soul is *electric* with wine', *ὄνῳ συγκεραυνωθείς φρένας*. Alcaeus, with his *τέγγε πνεύμονας ὄνῳ*, comes pretty close to the language of Chaucer in regard to the Miller's Wife:

As any jay she light was and jolif

So was her jolly whistle well *zuetle*.

Again we have Aristophanes saying in Plato's Symposium (176 B) that he was 'one of those that were *dipped* the day before' (*τῶν χθὲς βεβαπτισμένων*)

<sup>1</sup> This paper was read at the Second Annual Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, at Washington, D. C., April 24, 1908.

and his phrase reminds us of Shakespeare's, for the drinker who is beyond the stage of being a fool, beyond the madman stage, and has reached the third degree—'drowned'. A kindred use is that of *βρέχω*, 'to wet'. Pindar apparently opens the way for its figurative use, not in reference to intoxication, however. Then Euripides's *Electra* (El. 326) speaks of Aegistheus as *μέθῃ βρεχθεῖς*, 'steeped or soaked in drunkenness'. And finally Comedy gives us *βεβρεγμένος*, with no qualifying noun, so far as appears, in just the sense of the modern 'soaked' (Eubul. 126 ap. Athen. 1. 23 a b, etc.). Coupled with this participle we find (ibid.) *κεκυθωρισμένος*, a word which comes from *κῶθων* a Spartan soldier's drinking cup. 'In one's cups' would be almost as near as the English comes to this—unless indeed one might venture on 'canted' to correspond. Another word from the soldier's life is often found in Theognis, *θωρηχθεῖς*, 'breastplated', or perhaps simply 'armed'. A variation on this idea again is *ἀκροθώραξ* 'armed at the top', or perhaps 'superficially armed', and so 'slightly drunken'. Our own tongue knows the same metaphor in its 'in one's armor', 'primed', 'cocked', not to mention the tipler's 'pocket pistol' (compare also the humorous passage in Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 1132 ff.).

Most of the expressions thus far mentioned are merely more or less close resemblances to those of the English, but, when we say that a man 'takes the cake' for ingenuity or what not, it seems at first sight pretty clear that here we have a phrase borrowed directly or indirectly from the Greek symposium, and used in the slang sense even in Aristophanes. Thus in the *Knights* (276) the chorus says to Cleon: 'If you defeat him at shouting, you are the hip-hip-hurrah; but if he surpasses you in shamelessness, the cake is ours' (*ἡμέτερος ὁ πυραμοῦντα*). The scholiast carefully explains that this cake was one made of boiled honey and wheat, baked. Cakes of this sort people used as prizes for those that kept awake at a symposium. They were in the habit of vying at the symposia in the matter of ability to keep one's head up, and the man who kept awake till morning *ἐλάμβανε τὸν πυραμοῦντα*, 'took the cake'. Modern English lexicographers, however, say that our phrase is of comparatively recent origin and is derived from the cake-walk. If so, the likeness to the old Greek phrase may be merely a coincidence, though certainly a curious one.

The Romans, also, had many similar forms of speech. Such words as *temulentus*, *vinolentus*, *vinosus*, if we may judge from the way in which they seem to have been first used, were originally of slangy connotation, like the English 'winey', 'beery', 'groggy', although they later climbed to a higher position in linguistic society. Plautus presents several realistic scenes in which the words *madere* and *madidus* occur, with the sense of *βρέχεσθαι*,

*βεβρεγμένος*. Thus in the *Mostellaria* (319) Callidamates asks:

Ecquid tibi videor ma-m-ma-madere?

Compare also Pseudolus 1297:

Non vides me ut madide madeam?

These usages, I take it, were slang. But when Horace uses *uvividus* in his Odes (2. 19. 18; 4. 5. 39), although the underlying thought is the same, it would be hard to persuade most of us, even with those Chicagoan Echoes from the Sabine Farm still ringing in our ears, that "the most gentleman-like of the Roman poets" had used words which in his time had anything more than a colloquial coloring. And, of course, when we find *irriguum mero corpus* and *irrigare vino*, the presence of the ablatives assures us that these are merely metaphorical expressions and not yet slang. So many other polite phrases with *vino*, such as *vino obrutus*, *sepultus*, *gravis*, *oneratus*, need not be dwelt upon, although, like corresponding Greek phrases *ὄνυξ βεβαρημένος*, and others, they may suggest the English 'loaded' and 'jag'. When Petronius, however, says (67), *mulieres sauciae inter se riserunt*, he is presumably using a real vulgarism—one which looks at first sight like the modern *shot*, but as English etymologists connect the latter with *scot*—'a drink', we can mention as a parallel only the less common 'cut'. From this same writer (41) and from the same field of thought we have the phrase *staminatus duxi*, which apparently means 'I've had some good stiff ones',—drinks, of course.

In the sentimental phrases of love the Greeks and Romans were quite as prolific as we moderns. Ever since the days of Aristophanes, not to say how long before, fond lovers have been calling their sweethearts pet animal names: so the old woman in the *Plutus* (1010-1011) says that when her lover found her sorrowful he used fondly to call her 'ducky' and 'dovey' (*νητάρμιον καὶ φάττιον ὑπεκορίζτο*). Plautus (*Asinaria* 664 ff.) gives us another sample of the same erotic zoology in extenso. The fair Philaenium is begging the slave Leonidas for the twenty minas that will assure the continuance of her own and Argyrippus's love affair: 'O give me the money', she says, 'apple of my eye (*ocellus*), my rose, my life, my delight'. 'Well', answers Leonidas, 'call me your sparrowkins, biddy (*gallinam*), quail, your lamby, kidlet call me, or your little bossie (*vitellum*)'. And again a little later: 'Call me ducky, dovey, little tyke (*catellum*), swallow, daw, dear little sparrowkins'. Some of these words may have been inserted simply for comic effect, but I am inclined to think they are all real love terms. Parallels occur, of course, in many languages, as well as in many other similar passages in Greek and Latin.

But the animal kingdom is not the only one Cupid draws upon. A sweetheart may be, as in English, 'my honey' (*mel meum*, Plaut. *Bacch.* 1197. or



*mulsa mea*, Stich. 755) or just pure 'sweetness' (*suavitas*, *ibid.*) There were 'pearls', too, long before Bowery girls were ever heard of. Trimalchio, in that most modern style of his, tells us (Petron. 63), that his former master's favorite boy died, and he adds, 'A pearl he was, by heaven' (*mehercules margaritum*). Or again, as Lucretius remarks (4. 1163), if a lady is big and huge, she becomes in her lover's eyes *cataplexis*; that is, of course, 'a stunner'. Propertius (1. 20. 6) gives us 'flame' (*ardor*) in the sense of 'sweetheart', and he and Ovid both have what seems to be the equivalent of our word 'baggage' applied to mistresses; cf. Prop. 4. 3. 45-46 (Arethusa to Lycotas):

Romanis utinam patuissent castra puellis!  
essem militae sarcina fida tuae.

'Would that camps were open to Roman maids! Then would I be your faithful baggage in your warfare'. See also Ovid Her. 3. 68 (Briseis to Achilles):

Non ego sum classi sarcina magna tuae.

'I am no great piece of baggage for your fleet'. In both these examples there is much of the literal meaning, but in both also it is soldiers' baggage that is referred to. Now as one of the earliest meanings of *baggage* in English is a *soldier's mistress*, and as another early use is the playful one, like *minx* or *rogue*, I think it may be well that there is some more or less direct connection here between the Latin and the English.

A similar playful use of another harsh term is found as early as the *Odyssey* (5. 182), when Calypso tells Odysseus that he is really a 'sinner', *ἀσινός*, to have such shrewd thoughts.

Still another sort of slang, the coined word, we seemingly have in Petronius (61) where Niceros describes the object of his affection as *pulcherrimum bacciballum*, which the editors give up, but we might perhaps translate it 'She's the prettiest little umph-umph!' or, with reference to its possible derivation from *bac(c)a*, 'a peach'. The enthusiasm reminds one of Triton's description of Amydone in Lucian (D. M. 6. 1) as 'a right pretty thing', *παγκαλὸς τε χρῆμα*. Again, once more in Petronius (37), we are told that Fortunata was Trimalchio's 'all-in-all' (*Trimalchionis tota est*); perhaps we might even say she was *the whole thing* to Trimalchio. Long before, in its more correct form, the expression was proverbial, for Herodotus (1. 122) says that Cyno, the foster mother of Cyrus the Elder, was 'as the saying goes, everything to him' *ὅν τε οἱ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τὰ πάντα ἡ Κυνώ*.

'There are others', is another expressive modern phrase. But a fairly close parallel occurs, with the same withering contempt in it, as long ago as Homer. In the *Iliad* (1. 174) Agamemnon says to Achilles: 'Flee if you wish. I do not beg you to stay on my account. There are others with me, who will honor me', *παρ' ἑοῦ γέ καὶ ἄλλοι*.

In the *Odyssey* (21. 251) Eurymachus, failing to string the bow, remarks 'I do not grieve so very much about the marriage, though sorry I may be: there are many other Achaean women', *εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ Ἀχαιίδες*. But closer still is the passage of Lucretius (4. 1173): 'No matter how beautiful your sweetheart may be, or you may think she is, doubtless there are others too' (*nempe aliae quoque sunt*).

In many other departments of life these parallels abound. We still 'make beds', although not as literally as the ancients did (*πρωίηται εὐνή*, Od. 7. 342). And if it be asserted that the persistence of this phrase is merely due to the conservatism of the housewife, we might mention that sailors still 'make sail' (*zela facit*, Aen. 5. 281), and ships still 'run before the wind' (*θεούσης νηός* Od. 3. 281). Sprinters, too, still start from 'scratch' (*ἀπὸ νύσσης* Od. 8. 121), and, in the parlance of the sporting editor, men are still pugistically 'put to sleep' (in *soporem collocastis*, Plaut. Amph. 304). Most teachers can bear witness that there still live a few humans who have their 'brains in their heels' (*ἐγκέφαλον . . . ἐν ταῖς πτέραις* [Dem.] 7. 45). Folk still occasionally waste away to mere 'skin and bones' (*ὄστια καὶ δέρμα*, Theocr. 2. 90; *ossa ac pellis*, Plaut. Aul. 564) and are still, sad to say, occasionally 'abandoned by the physicians',—at least in patent medicine advertisements (*derelictus a medicis*, C. I. L. 6. 68). Even to-day, when our warnings turn out right, we remark 'I told you so' (*dicebam vobis*, Sen. Apocol. 12) or we punctuate a narrative with a 'D'you see?' or brusquer 'See?' (*ὄρᾱς*, Luc. Peregr. 45); we 'die a-laughing', once in a great while (*γέλῳ ἐκθανοῖ*, Od. 18. 100; *risu emoriri*, Ter. Eun. 432), or we perhaps greet a story from some amateur Munchausen with a 'Then I awoke!' (*κἄτ', ἐγὼ γ' ἐξηγρόμην*, Ar. Ran. 51). Again we say 'I'll be off', just as did the Aristophanic Socrates (Nub. 887, *ἐγὼ δ' ἀπέσομαι*), or we feel like quoting, perhaps, when a book agent calls, a very literal rendering of the words of the untutored Strepsiades, *οὐκ ἀποδιώξεις σαυτὸν* (Ar. Nub. 1296).

And then how natural the long ancient list of intensives seems, both adjectives and adverbs, like 'atrocious' piece of cleverness (*atrocem . . . astutiam*, Plaut. Capt. 539), 'horrible' vigilance (*horribili vigilantia*, Cic. Att. 8. 9. 4); 'awfully' and 'dreadfully', *αἰνῶς*, *δεινῶς*; most 'desperately' skilful (*desperatum valde ingeniosus*, Petron. 68); gashed his leg 'in fine style', *διδόμει τὸ σκέλος χρηστῶς πάνυ* (Menand. Geneva frag. 1. 48); 'inconceivably' well, *ἀμυχανῶς ὥς εἰ* (Plat. Rep. 527 E); to love 'mightily' (*amare valide*, Plaut. Merc. 42); 'monstrously' patriotic (*φιλᾶσθῆναι ὑπερφυῶς* Ar. Ach. 142); 'perfectly' filthy (*ρυπῶς ἀκριβῶς* Luc. Peregr. 36); scorch 'em 'royally' (*γενναῶς καὶ αὐτοῦς* Luc. Char. 14).

Such are some of the countless parallels more or

less close that the Classics reveal. They seem to me to suggest various things. First of all, they give evidence of the existence of a great body of slang in Greek and Latin. No one, indeed, who knows his Aristophanes and his Plautus or Petronius would venture to suggest that anything else was the case. And there is doubtless very little reason for believing even that the ancients had any less slang than we, for as every new excavation and every new papyrus from Egypt abundantly shows, they were men of like passions with ourselves. Only, aside from the old schoolboy idea that the Greeks and Romans were automatons, not humans, our practice in Greek and Latin composition, with its inculcation of the constant necessity of *ὥστε* and *quasi*, *τίς* and *quidam*, leads us naturally to believe that they were never venturesome in language without apologizing for it, and always steered clear of unusual words as Caesar warns one to do. And, of course, slang is nothing if not unusual and venturesome.

Further, on the side of their likeness, these parallels may help to show that at least an appreciable part of our current slang and colloquial speech is derivable from the Classics; that is, is due to our schoolboys and college men, and goes back to an original academic use. Of course, we must leave room for mere coincidence; many times and quite independently two or more nations in widely different ages may perfectly well have hit on phrases the same both verbally and in thought. We must take into account similarity of circumstances and of psychological processes. And on such grounds as these perhaps the majority of the resemblances quoted above should be explained.

But there are a number of reasons why we may think that in many other cases a more or less direct connection and not simple coincidence furnishes the real explanation, even though such connection cannot be traced out in full. An academic source and history and later popular use are not *a priori* incompatible. Many words in our language now popular were once learned. Again, many words which came obviously from the Classics, especially Latin or dog-Latin, although now in more or less respectable use, must originally have been colloquial or slangy, e. g. *nostrum*, *nincompoop*, *omniumgathering*, *quidnunc*, *tandem*, *sophomore*. Most of these have been incorporated bodily, and their origin is easily recognizable. Where words are translated, however, the relationship is obscured. And yet in many phrases in common use we have obvious translations: *rare bird*, *Homer nods*, *sound mind in a sound body*, perhaps *willy-nilly* (*velim nolim, velit nolit*). A similar literary origin—not classical—is certain also for much English slang. Shakespeare is the source of some; so is the Bible—for example, of *Jehu*, *Jonah*, *raise Cain*, the two last, at least, thoroughly popular to-day. There is, therefore, rea-

son enough why some of our slang that resembles that of the ancients should be suspected of coming directly from them by way of translation, provided only that those who have studied Greek and Latin are likely to have performed such a service. And of this there can be but little doubt.

For students in school and college are unquestionably frequent users and coiners of slang, and at the same time greatly interested in certain sides of their Classics. Witness the numberless sonnets to fair Lalages that college papers publish, such punning schoolboy jokes as A motto for a young Ladies' Seminary—*iubet vicissim*<sup>1</sup>; slang nicknames like *Dinnie* for *Eddie* from *δίνη* 'an eddy'; the batrachian college yell, *Brekekekex-coax-coax*. Numerous macaronic poems also show the same tendency of the undergraduate to turn his Classics to practical use.

The English undergraduate has both greater familiarity with the Classics than has the American and apparently an equally marked tendency to use slang, so that we may reasonably believe that he has done his share in translating ancient slang into English, as he certainly has in transferring Latin and Greek words bodily into present slang use. For example, among such learned English slang is *gyf*, a college servant, traditionally said to be derived from *γύψ*, 'a vulture', because of the cupidity of the class. *Kudos*, transliterated from *κῦδος* in Browning's fashion, is used in the sense of 'glory', 'prestige', and although the term has found considerable literary use, it must originally have been pure slang.

WILLIAM W. BAKER

HAVERFORD COLLEGE

#### LATIN WORD-ORDER AGAIN

Professor Preble's critique<sup>2</sup> of my earlier paper on order and emphasis in Latin deserves wide attention. It is gratifying to find that he concedes some of my contentions, notably the frequency of climax; this would include, I suppose, the climactic force of numerous connectives, such as *non modo . . . sed etiam*, and the like; and all this, as it seems to me, establishes my main assertion, that emphasis in Latin is, in general, progressive, forward-moving. My paper does not maintain that position determines emphasis absolutely, but that the Latin habit is to put the stronger or more significant word, phrase, or clause after the less important. It is conceivable that coordinate words, phrases and clauses might have been thus arranged, while the individual syntactical groups were built on the opposite principle; but this seems to me very unnatural, and therefore *a priori* very improbable. For the present, I am content to stand

<sup>1</sup> It might be noted that this pun plainly dates from a time since the introduction of the Roman method of pronunciation, as well as previous to the last decade's tremendous emphasis upon quantities, for *iubet vicissim* is not the sort of thing the trained modern vowel-marker would be guilty of.

<sup>2</sup> See THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2, 110-114. Attention may be called also to a paper on Latin Word-Order, in The School Review for April, 1909, by Dr. C. H. Meader of the University of Michigan. C. K.

with Quintilian on the general principle.

Some of Professor Preble's examples and interpretations suggest the power of a theory to warp a scholar's judgment. My opinion against his proves nothing, of course; but it would be easy to submit some of the points of difference to a sort of arbitration, at once competent and impartial. Suppose a literal translation of Cicero be put into the hands of a master of the art of English expression, choosing one who is unacquainted with the original Latin or with theories of Latin order. Ask him to read Cato Maior, 31 and 32. After dwelling upon Nestor and Agamemnon, will he proceed thus: 'But now I *return* to myself. I *am passing* my four and eightieth year?' (Sed redeo ad me. Quantum ago annum et octogesimum). In § 56, shall we hear him say, 'But I *come* to the farmers, that I may not get away from my own case?' (Sed venio ad agricolas, ne a me ipso recedam). Will he finish Laelius 1 thus: 'But of this man at another time: now I *return* to the augur?' (Sed de hoc alias; nunc redeo ad augurum). Of course, in Cato Maior 45, *ad me ipsum iam revertar*, *me* deserves emphasis for two reasons at least: the sense requires it, precisely as it does in the foregoing cases, and the intensive *ipsum* is added. If I were to hazard a guess at the reason for the different order and form of expression, I should say that Cicero, like every good writer, varies for the sake of variety, and as *revertar* is a much better word than *redeo* with which to close a sentence, he adds *ipsum* just because *me* is not in a position that suggests emphasis. The same might be said of *ne a me ipso recedam*. Sentences can be found without difficulty where emphasis really belongs on the first word or word-group; but to maintain that it is necessarily and regularly so, is quite a different matter.

Professor Preble goes so far as to suggest the emphasizing of prepositions to save his rule. He would read 'Not only from disaster, but also from the dread of disaster' (*calamitatis formidine*). But 'of' has no counterpart in Latin except the case ending: we are to infer that Cicero said calamitatis formidine? Again he extracts a thunderous BECAUSE out of a very innocent looking *eo* before *magis*; but the ablative of degree of difference regularly precedes. Shall we say everywhere for *quo . . . eo* and the like, 'THE more . . . THE more'? When a theory drives its champions to such lengths, one must congratulate one's self upon having thrown off its yoke.

Apparently my reason for citing strings of verbs, *veni, vidi, vici*, etc., was not clearly perceived. A note was made of climax in one example, but the purpose of the citations was to refute, if possible, the assertion that the Romans regarded the verb as the least emphatic element in the sentence. Most of the examples were from Terence, and poetry

is not the place to study emphasis in prose.

But Professor Preble wonders whether I would emphasize *Clodius* (Milo 34) three times in succession. We should all agree that he richly deserves it; but let us see.

In the first place, we must go back a little farther than Professor Preble does in order to catch the movement of the stream of thought. Cicero first states the conclusion of his preceding argument and makes his transition.

'You have heard, gentlemen of the jury, how greatly it was to the interest of Clodius that Milo should be slain; direct your attention now in turn to Milo. Why was it to Milo's interest that Clodius should be killed? What reason was there, I will not say why Milo should do the deed, but should even wish it done? "It was Clodius", you will say, "who was frustrating Milo's hope of the consulship". I answer, though he was opposing him, (Milo) was succeeding, nay more, he was succeeding all the better, nor did he find me a more valuable supporter than Clodius was'. (To parody a noted utterance, they loved Milo for the enemies he had made).

Professor Preble's slip in rendering *fecbat* as though it were *factus est*, though not necessarily fatal to his argument, does seem to me to obscure somewhat the proper emphasis. Of course, Milo was never elected consul.

To me it seems clear that *occidi MILONEM* is the chief thought in the first sentence. That *interfici CLODIUM* is in sharp and intentional contrast with *occidi Milonem*, and that *Clodium* therefore deserves strong emphasis seems equally plain. In the following sentence *Clodius* and *consulatus* are the indispensable words; *Miloni* might have been *huic* ('my client'). It stands where it does, if emphasis had anything to do with it, as a 'low level' between the two most emphatic words. In the third case, *Clodio* stands after *quam* and therefore in a stereotyped order (my article in The School Review 15, 643 ff., includes a brief comment on *quam*). Even here the most striking point is suggested by *Clodio*, though stress of voice is perhaps not needed to enforce it.

The foregoing translation was left wholly in Roman type, so as not to distract attention from the course of thought. In reading it, I should put a recognizable emphasis upon Clodius, Milo, slain (strongest upon Milo, because it is not only contrasted with the preceding Clodius, but the orator would already have in mind the approaching antithesis), Milo, Milo's (slight), Clodius, killed (slight, as an echo of 'slain'), do, wish (Milo is needed here only to avoid ambiguity), Clodius, consulship, succeeding (very strong), better (still stronger), me, Clodius. Here again, any who are interested might ask their colleagues in the department of public speaking to interpret this passage.



I dare not claim to be entirely free from that bias of the advocate which seems to me so apparent in others.

In order to think clearly about any such passage, we must note carefully the Latin form of expression. In *eo repugnante*, we have the weakest demonstrative in the ablative absolute with a participle, echoing a thought already expressed, and followed by a new and striking thought in the main verb *hiebat*. So important is this assertion that Cicero with an *immo vero* repeats it in a still stronger form. How shall we be convinced that Cicero here expresses his most prominent, important, emphatic idea in an ablative absolute, and follows it, by "a Roman habit of thought", with the "least emphatic part in verb form"? When we render freely, 'despite his opposition', or the like, we introduce words relatively more important in the English sentence than the equivalents are in the Latin. 'Despite', or 'in spite of', indeed, are not in the Latin at all. They express and exaggerate the concessive notion which is merely suggested by the juxtaposition of the ideas of opposition and success.

It would be instructive, if we could know whether the friends of Professor Preble's theory would with practical unanimity approve the view that every one of the final words and word-groups in this passage is in "the position of least emphasis".

With these sample criticisms of Professor Preble's views and strictures, I must leave my contentions for the present to stand or fall on their merits. It would be interesting to learn whether any progress at all is making toward a common view. Perhaps the thorough-going advocates of the Greenough-Preble theory would be willing to answer a few queries.

(1) Do they emphasize in their class-rooms the frequency of climax in Latin, and the climactic force of certain connectives?<sup>1</sup> Do they instruct their pupils in composition to put the more emphatic or significant word, phrase, or clause after those that are less so, in a coordinate series?

So far as I have observed, there is not a line or even a word in Allen and Greenough or in Professor Preble's excellent grammar to indicate that climax has any place in Latin style, or any influence on the order of words.

(2) Do they teach that the result clause is always less important than the clause on which it depends, unless it "precedes for emphasis"? And how many examples have they collected of the result before the cause?

(3) Do they teach that parenthetical clauses (*ut haec omittam* and the like) are always more important than regular purpose clauses following the verb?

<sup>1</sup> The writer found recently that out of a freshman division of about twenty men only one had ever heard this principle stated. Nearly all had used the Allen and Greenough grammar.

(4) Do they teach that the relative is regularly emphatic? (see A. and G., 598, c, second example). And have they attained facility in framing English examples in which the same thing is true? For instance, in the example just referred to above, colloquial English would omit the relative altogether ('the fellow-citizens we have lost', etc., *quos omisimus civis*).

(5) Do they guide their students to the proper emphasis through the sense and connection, as must be done in living languages, or do they encourage them to place the emphasis by a purely mechanical rule?

(6) And lastly, if Latin was really written by the aid of such a principle, will they not explain the fact that Quintilian had never heard of it? Certainly he distinctly affirms that if a word is to produce the strongest effect, it must be put not in the middle, nor (if silence is conclusive) at the beginning, but at the end.

I know by experience that it is not easy to see the weak points in a theory long accepted and taught. But all who even aspire to sound scholarship are of course desirous of the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

JOHN GREENE

## REVIEWS

Testimonium Animae, or Greek and Roman before Jesus Christ. Essays dealing with the Spiritual Elements in Classical Civilization. By E. G. Sihler. New York: G. E. Stechert & Co. (1908). Pp. 452. \$2.25.

American classical scholars have been very ready to contribute the results of their study and reflection to all kinds of publications, and in many cases these papers have been collected into volumes and constitute a valuable part of our literature; but otherwise, outside of editions and technical treatises, very few have published any extensive study of ancient life and conditions; consequently, the book under review is a unique appearance.

Professor Sihler is well known for his exact and searching scholarship; in his *Testimonium Animae* he gives evidence of these qualities on every page. He has a healthy contempt for second-hand sources, and for his knowledge of ancient conditions harks back in every instance to the ancient authors themselves. Such a practise is apt to lead to remarkable results, for throughout the long period of incrustation of commentary upon commentary, and of investigation upon investigation, the actual facts of ancient life have often been strangely hidden.

The book in brief is an investigation into the fundamental principles underlying the life of Greece and Rome before the advent of Christianity.

Before proceeding to the detailed examination of ancient life he discusses, in two introductory chap-

ters, first, the general implications of classical culture as understood by philosophical thinkers of the modern age from Herder to Matthew Arnold, and, secondly, the moral atmosphere of the humanists—the atmosphere inaugurated by Petrarch at the Revival of Learning. He shows that humanism was in reality a revival of paganism, cloaking under an outward worship of classical form the most flagrant immorality combined with a cynical view of all religious questions.

In Chapter III (Gods and Men in Homer and Hesiod), Professor Sihler shows that in the Homeric conception the gods were little more than personified animal instincts. There was no spiritual feeling; "Neither purity nor humility nor mercy have a seat at the Olympian board . . . the gods are merely narrowed powers and impulses of men . . . lustful and adulterous even . . . to such an extent that many Greek teachers and scholars were disturbed at the picture of the gods that Homer gives".

In play after play we find along with aesthetic ideals, more is discernible than an attempt to develop a philosophy of actual life, a feeling that the governing principle is fate, but a fate that "is incomputable and incalculable", "akin to blind whim". Their morality "in the main is of the utilitarian order", and their wisdom "is that of deeper and better fathomed self-interest". Practical wisdom is the chief end of men. The lyric poets, too (Chapter V), have no uplifting message. There is beauty, there is art in their work, but the canker that underlies all Greek life is also in evidence throughout. In the iambic writers, particularly, we notice the abandonment entirely of the Greek virtue of self-control and sanity. What was left untouched in the earlier period is debased in this. "Even the noble figure of Penelope is dragged down from the superb elevation of the Odyssey. . . . Thus, with all the canonization of Homer, the Greeks honored neither the heroism of the Iliad, for which dishonor there was more warrant, nor the lady of Ithaca". The lowest depth of erotic depravity is observed in Sappho.

The Greeks did worship heroes (Chapter VI), but this worship was largely connected with the narrowness of the Greek communal life, and was really the canonization of men to whom they had been under obligations. Even here there is no appreciation for the human soul and its destiny. It was the worship of naturalness under which was understood the naturalness of Kypris.

But there was a reaction against this Homeric attitude of the Greeks toward all things moral and spiritual which was partly voiced by Pythagoras and his school. To them the body was not the *summum bonum* of existence, but the prison, the tomb. We find that craving after genuine immortality (Chapter VII) also apparent in the celebrations of mystic rites that took place in various parts of Greece.

Still even Pythagoras could not escape the feeling that the regulation of this life was not left to the discretion of man, but was under the domination of the gods. "There was very little of genuine spirituality in the secret rites. The *circle of life* there was, the symbolism of the endless succession of seed and fruit, of germ and growth, but there was no radical emancipation from the prevalent nature-cult". The interpretation of the attitude of the gods to man, their envy, their jealousy, their irresponsible arbitrariness are everywhere apparent, even in such an author as Aeschylus, great and noble though he was. "Even he could not divest the sovereign deity of Zeus of the low and mean elements which stained it in all the legends". In Herodotus, too, while he delights in bright and sunny things, there occurs incessantly that "stern and awful motive, the envy of the gods, a theme which he elevates into a veritable philosophy of history".

A whole chapter (IX) is devoted to Sophocles of Kolonos, the great example of Greek tragedy, but this man was stained in his private life by the regular Greek perversion and could not, with all his power, get away from Homeric tradition of the gods. In play after play we find along with aesthetic ideals a repetition of the Homeric revolting myths.

In Euripides (Chapter X) a new element enters. He was early filled with the conviction that God must be preeminently good, and, as a consequence, was forced to turn his back upon the legends of the gods of Greece. Not only do we find two heroes in Euripides's plays who are distinguished by chastity, but we find the attempt everywhere to elevate the human soul. Euripides was not devoted to the standards current in his day; he held world-wide views, and he was profoundly in earnest, a supremely spiritual soul.

Chapter XI (The Triad of Greek Thinkers) is one of the most valuable in the book. The thinkers referred to are Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. It is impossible to summarize the chapter, but it might be worth while to quote a few sentences. Socrates emphasized this "great theme—namely, that the soul is very precious—among a people than whom no other ever more highly prized the comeliness of the physical person". His fundamental error lay "in the belief that wrong acting and all sin could or must be reduced to faulty judgment". He sought to conceive the gods in a loftier way than was customary, for, as Xenophon says, "he held that gods were concerned for men not in the fashion in which the general public hold; . . . the gods knew all things, both what was said and what was done and what was deliberated in silence, and were present everywhere and made signification to men about all human affairs. . . . The argument of design was one of the foremost things in his soul—he claimed here the manifest revelation of a divine providence".



While he made great use of Homer, he seems to have ignored the Homeric anthropomorphism. "Socrates then, in facing death, soberly and gravely, not in a rapture of enthusiasm, but, if I may say so, with supreme intelligence and with no transcendental consolation or spiritual support, is a grave figure".

Plato "Early in his intellectual life . . . despaired of satisfying his soul with this material nature of sense and seeming". His hard problem was "to understand how omnipotence and goodness could be conceived as being consistent with the actual sin and evil in the world. And as for the essential goodness of God he maintained it with categorical affirmation. . . . Is it well with the soul, the primary part of man"? was to Plato "the criterion of life and happiness". Plato's tenet was "the primacy of the soul and its supremacy in the hierarchy of being due to its essential resemblance, as to its source and as to its aim, to God".

Aristotle was the most remarkable of the ancients, called by Dante "the Master of those who *know*", but he looked upon knowledge from the scientific rather than from the ethical standpoint. According to Aristotle "God needs no friend; bliss is in himself. . . . An academic and cosmic God, but singularly and utterly severed from human beings by his essence". "Contemplation is Aristotle's personal ideal; his confession of faith. His God is absorbed in contemplation; he is the Intelligence of the Universe; therefore, the searching and the thinking philosopher is nearest to God. . . . The life and conduct of man is to be determined by himself alone. There is no anticipation of a life to come, nor any divine law imposing itself upon men. . . . Pleasure is the crown and result of all moral or perfect action. . . . There is a curious and painful lack of absolute and universal law in Aristotle's ethics".

Passing over the next two chapters on Hellenic Decay and Morality and The Actual Worship in Greek Communities we come to the discussion of Roman spiritual elements. This is much briefer than the Greek, occupying but one-fourth of the book, and is treated with much more sympathy. The Roman spirit is much more serious than the Greek; it is devoted to the actual, the real, the concrete, and the ideal of duty is a fundamental one. This is shown in their political organization, their method of living and the minutiae of their worship. But even in Rome there was little of genuine spirituality, though there was a great deal of stern morality based rather on practical than on ethical foundations.

The Roman worthies that Professor Sihler treats are Cicero, Cato of Utica, Lucretius, Horace and the greater Seneca. He treats them all with keen discrimination and sympathy, not overlooking their faults and weaknesses, but showing throughout that they represent in general progressive types and that they are thinkers striving more or less unaided

after spiritual growth. There is a general apparent preparation for the advent of Christianity shown in these men, and in Seneca we find this unaided progress most complete. The high estimate of Seneca, which is unquestionably deserved, is somewhat out of keeping with the present view of that versatile philosopher, but seems to be well founded and may possibly have something to do with bringing about a rehabilitation of his work in the eyes of modern thinkers.

The book as a whole is a very important treatise to students of the history of theology. It is likewise of great value to students of the Classics, not that classical scholars are unaware—at least, in a general way—of most of what Professor Sihler observes, but in the course of centuries the origins of Greek life and feeling have become dimmed, and our attention is now directed more to the finished literary product. It is a matter of congratulation that the elements of decay from which sprung the flower of Greek literature are practically unobserved by all younger students of the Classics. Homer makes his appeal without inspiring any consciousness of the actual nature of certain mythological relations. The stories of the gods are regarded by most children, if not by all, as in the same line with our fairy tales. The purifying power of ignorance has idealized almost all that is corrupt, and therefore the study of the Classics still remains an abiding power for sane and good enjoyment as well as for training. Consequently while it is desirable that those who teach the Classics should know all that is in Professor Sihler's book, it should not make them pessimistic as to their value, nor should it lead them to the mistake that because the soil is often fetid, the flower is therefore tainted. G. L.

Historical and Geographical Investigations in Central Italy, Magna Graecia, Sicily and Sardinia. By Ettore Pais, Translated from the Italian by C. Denmore Curtis. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press (1908). \$5.00. Pp. XIV+441. With Ten Illustrations and Eleven Plates.

The twenty-six papers contained in this volume are in part the preliminary studies for and partly the aftermath of the author's *Storia della Sicilia* and *Storia di Roma*. As he states in his preface, some of the papers were written in recent years, others at a much earlier time, but having been published in the proceedings of various Italian societies they reached a very limited public, and contain practically unpublished material. Their republication in English will be cordially welcomed by English and American students of history and classical philology. It is only to be regretted that in the case of papers that have been republished the date and place of original publication have not been given.

In reviewing a volume of miscellaneous papers on problems which are for the most part still *sub*

*iudice*, it is out of question to weigh all the author's conclusions in the light of the evidence, and one has the alternative either of singling out a few of the papers without doing justice to the rest, or of treating rather cursorily of all. In this instance a summary of the author's conclusions will be more profitable to the readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* than the animadversions of the reviewer.

With the exception of the last of the series, No. XXVI, which deals with the date and place of composition of Strabo's Historical Geography, the papers fall into two groups, papers I-XIV dealing chiefly with Magna Graecia and Sicily, XV-XXV with Central Italy and Sardinia.

The papers in the first group are for the most part short and have to do mainly with the identification of historical sites in Magna Graecia and Sicily. But, though brief, and relatively less important than the articles of the second group, they serve to illustrate in a more tangible way some points in the author's historical method; his keen observation, his vast reading, his ability to make use of every bit of evidence, and his ingenuity in piecing it together, by which he arrives at a conclusion that is usually convincing in problems which have been puzzling historians for many years.

In several papers he resorts, upon sufficient evidence, to emendation and thus disposes of towns whose names are mentioned but once in ancient records, and which are otherwise unknown. Thus in VI he clears up the unknown *ad Sapriportum* of Livy 26. 39. 6 by emending to *ad Satyriportum*, a place not far from Tarentum; in XI he shows that the *Ταρακίαι*, against whom the Syracusans marched in Diodorus 12. 29, had no existence, but that the word is a corruption for *Πιακίαι*, and that Piacus is the place referred to, a very justifiable emendation in the light of the evidence which he adduces; similarly in XIV he shows that *τὴν Φοινίκην* referred to by Polyaeus 5. 3. 6. in connection with the pretended expedition of Agathocles is a mistake for *Φοινίξ*, a town near Tauro-menium. Other identifications are as follows: in VII he shows that on the bronze *caduceus* found near Brindisi containing an inscription which is to be interpreted as *δαμόσιον Θουρίων* and *δαμόσιον Βρενθεσίλων* the former people are not the inhabitants of Thurii, as is ordinarily supposed, but of Thuriae near Brindisi (Liv. 9. 43), which he identifies with Turenum, the modern Trani; in X he endeavors to show that the coins with the inscription M E R and the head of a bearded Dionysus on the obverse, and on the reverse a vine branch with grapes belonged not to Ergetium, near Arpi, but to Sergentium, or Ergetium on the slope of Aetna, citing in evidence the close similarity of the coins of the neighboring Naxos; in XIII he identifies the As-sinarus, the river on which took place the defeat

of the Athenians in Sicily, with the ancient Elorus and the modern Tellaro, stating that this is the only river leading inland to the Heraean plateau, and the only one which would suit the plans of the Athenians in their retreat, and citing further the local pronunciation Atiddaru=*Ἀσσίναρος*. Perhaps the cleverest of these topographical papers is the attempt to fix a site for Ancient Terina that will harmonize with ancient historical references as well as with the archaeological evidence. Thucydides calls the Gulf of Squillace *Τερίαιον κόλπον*, whereas that name was usually given to the Golfo di S. Euphemia, on the Tyrrhenian sea. By locating the original site at Tiriolo, which dominates both seas, and which shows archaeological remains of a city of considerable size Pais shows how the name *Τερίαιος κόλπος* might have been applied to both seas. In Tiriolo he sees the relic of the name Terina. In IX, in an exceedingly interesting paper, he tries to show that the Elymians about Eryx were not of Semitic but of Ligurian origin, and he attempts to prove that the Ligurians were Aryans. His chain of proof rests upon a series of names related to Eryx, which he regards as identical, viz: *Eryx*, *Ἐρύκη*, a town of the Ausonian Siculi, the Volscian *Verrugo*, the Latin *verruca* meaning 'height', *Verruca*, the mediaeval name for Eryx, the modern Ligurian localities called *Verruche* or *Verruciole*, and the *Civitas Vericulana*. These are of Aryan origin, and are the records of an extensive Ligurian invasion.

In all these papers we are impressed by the industry, ingenuity, and extensive learning which has brought together all sorts of proof, literary, legendary, philological, archaeological and toponomical, but in the mass of conflicting evidence Pais often fails to state his own conclusions with sufficient definiteness or emphasis, so that one is occasionally obliged to read the paper a second time to discover what his opinion really is; in fact this vagueness is sometimes productive of positive vexation, and might have been remedied by a concluding paragraph. In the case of some papers, it is only in the index that the reader finds a positive statement of the author's view.

More important, and perhaps more interesting to the readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* are the papers numbered XV-XXV, which have to do with the history of Central Italy. Of these papers XV-XIX deal with the culture history of Campania. In XV he adduces convincing proof in support of the statement of Polybius 2. 91. 4 that the Daunians inhabited the south and east of Campania, and endeavors to locate this Daunian population in the neighborhood of the ancient Hyria and Fenser. These two towns he placed in the valley of the Sar-nus, and points out the identity of name between Hyria and the Hyria in Daunian territory on the Adriatic side of the mountains. In XVI, in an interesting and somewhat lengthy paper, he deals with

the several phases of the early history of Ischia, proving that the statement of Strabo that it was prosperous "on account of its gold mines, τὰ χρυσεία", is corrupt and should read "on account of its potteries, τὰ χυτρεῖα". He discusses its relation to the sea power of Syracuse, and of Naples, locates the fortress of the Syracusans in the castle of Ischia, and identifies the City of Pithecusa either with the Castle of Ischia or with the town which, according to Pliny, disappeared in antiquity leaving in its place a lake. The paper contains much interesting material, but is subject to the criticism already made in the case of the earlier papers that the failure to set forth a summary of the conclusions subjects the reader to unnecessary labor. In XVII he controverts the general opinion that Naples lost Ischia when she came into the hands of the Romans in 326 B. C., by showing that in this case the Romans would have had no object in placing in 313 B. C. a colony at Pontia, a place of much less strategic importance than Ischia. He concludes that Naples kept Ischia until the time of Sulla, by whom it was taken and deprived of its treasures and from which time it was supplanted in naval importance by Puteoli. In XVII he treats of an archaic head found near Sorrento and discusses the probable location of the temple of the Sirens. In XIX he discusses a Greek epitaph of Domitia Calliste at Naples, which states that she was a priestess of Athena Siciliana. He decides that Athena Siciliana is to be connected with the Athenaion on the Sorrentine peninsula. The introduction of the cult probably belonged to the period of the Syracusan naval supremacy during which the whole south coast was called Sicilian, and, on the evacuation of this sea by the Syracusans, the Neapolitans took over the stronghold and preserved the cult.

Papers XX and XXI are among the longest and most important in the book. In the former he treats of the Siceliot, and the latter the Italiot, Samnite and Campanian elements in the history of Rome. The views which he here presents are especially worthy of consideration because of his familiarity both with the history of Magna Graecia and Sicily, on the one hand, and with that of Rome on the other. He is therefore in a position to speak as one having a double authority. In his scepticism concerning early Roman history, he out-Germans the Germans in rejecting the statements of Roman historians. In the first of these two papers he shows that since many of the sources of Roman historians were Greek, and especially Sicilian, writers, who first occupied themselves with Roman history, it is not unnatural to suppose that they partly saw and partly created parallels between Roman history and that of Sicily, and that these parallels and synchronisms were taken over by the Roman historians. For instance, the first secession of the Roman plebs (which, however, has been questioned by others on

other grounds) is, according to Pais, even in its details, an echo of a secession of the plebs which took place at Gela, and the part taken by Menenius Agrippa resembles very closely that of Telines in the Sicilian episode. Another similarity is the cult of Ceres which figures in the two secessions. This cult was of Sicilian origin and the author's theory is that the legend of the Secession at Gela penetrated to Rome with the adoption of the cult, just as the adoption of the cult of Castor and Pollux from Magna Graecia gave rise to the legend of the battle of Lake Regillus, which had its starting point in the battle of the Sagras fought between Locri and Croton in the sixth century. He points out the synchronism between this false secession and the securing of Syracuse through a secession by Gelo, priest of Persephone and Demeter. He suggests that all the concomitants of the precautions for the protection of the plebs, the plebeian aediles, the tribunate, the asylum and the statue of Marsyas as a symbol of plebeian liberty, are of Greek origin, and are derived from the influence of Syracuse, which was mistress of this portion of the Mediterranean from 374 to 357 B. C. The story of Coriolanus is an infiltration into Roman history of the law of petalism at Syracuse. He concludes with the statement that Roman history till the fourth century is false and legendary, that history was a political product, and that, if we knew more of the history of Syracuse, we should know more of the history of Rome, and its sources.

In the second of these two papers he goes on to show that many phases of the military, administrative and judicial organization of Rome were adaptations from her neighbors of southern Italy. His most radical position is that concerning the Twelve Tables, which, he maintains, were influenced by the compilation of Protagoras at Thurii which formed the basis of the *ius gentium* and the *ius naturale*. This connection between Rome and Magna Graecia was broken off by the decline of the latter, and its place was taken by the Etruscans, the Oscans, and the cities of Sicily. The indebtedness of Rome to Magna Graecia is overlooked by the Roman historians because of the circumstance that, when Rome came to have a literature, the direct Greek influences were those of Athens, Pergamum and Alexandria. Many of the positions taken in these two papers are radical, even for a modern Roman historian, and especially for an Italian, but are worthy of careful consideration, as throwing a new light upon a dark side of Roman history.

Two defects of the book have already been mentioned: the lack of a definite statement of the author's conclusions in the more controversial articles, and the failure to give the date of publication of the republished papers. On p. 221 Pais states that the date of the evacuation of Ischia by the Syracusans was 427 or 415 B. C. at the latest; yet in



the paper numbered XVI in dealing with this very question he gives no such specific date, and it would be of value to the reader to know which of the two papers is the later, and represents the writer's latest views. A few rough charts would have been decidedly helpful in illustration of the papers which deal with disputed topography, e. g. of that concerning the location of Terina. Typographical errors are not uncommon: cf. *Ansonians* (p. 18); *pros pere* (p. 94); *Eridamus* (p. 153); 47 B. C. for 474 B. C. (p. 220); *provocatione* (p. 285); *Procusular* (383); *Sardina* (p. 440); *Voltaterrae* (p. 441). The expression "Mediterranean City", and "Fasti Consolari" are errors of the translator. The book is provided with an index of proper names, but there are some omissions, and occasionally errors, e. g. under Nuraghi the reference to p. 171 is wrong.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, St. Louis

F. W. SHIPLEY

The *Electra* of Sophocles, with a Commentary abridged from the larger Edition of Sir Richard C. Jebb, by Gilbert A. Davies. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons (1908). \$1.10.

Granted the superexcellence of Sir Richard C. Jebb's edition of *The Plays and Fragments of Sophocles*—and few are rash enough to dispute it—there is little to be said about the abridgment of Jebb's *Electra* by Gilbert A. Davies, Professor of Greek in the University of Glasgow, made as are others in the series of abridgments now complete for the seven plays, by the simple process of omission, except that this process has been applied with care and good judgment. Apart from the carrying out of this well-defined plan the abridger's hand does not much appear. The restrained task, however, is well done. The meat of the matter is kept; the difficult points are explained; what we seek we find. We lose regretfully some comments, especially those that throw light on ancient custom, such as the note in the larger edition on γένος (485). So, too, some examples of Jebb's *curiosa felicitas* might have been borrowed from the translation accompanying the larger edition to the edification of the abler student.

The omissions are, in general, these: many footnotes to the introduction; the paragraphs of the introduction on the translation of the *Electra* by Atilius, on the *Oreste* of Voltaire, on the *Oreste* of Alfieri, and on traces in art of the Aeschylean and Sophoclean plays; a part of the discussion of manuscripts, editions, etc., a part of the elaborate metrical analysis; a part of the critical apparatus; the translation accompanying the text; many discussions of readings and emendations, and discursive parts of other notes; the critical appendix. The residuum is this: a verbatim remainder of the introduction giving an account of the development of the *Orestes* story from Homer to Aeschylus and of the dra-

matization of the story by Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides; a discussion of manuscripts, editions, etc.; a good and sufficient metrical analysis; a cast of parts; a structural analysis of the play; a list of *dramatis personae*; Jebb's text with variant readings and some emendations given in footnotes; one hundred and twenty-seven pages of notes—a well-nigh verbatim reduction from the larger commentary; a Greek index; an English index.

In the introduction to this or any edition of a play of Sophocles a few words on the life of Sophocles and a few more on the constraint of legend and dramatic convention on the Greek dramatist would be welcome. The student may turn to his dictionary for these matters and will not; his instructor should tell him of them and may not. The asterisks marking suspected readings are not well deleted from the text; variant readings and emendations are well put under the eye in footnotes. Stage directions in the Greek text are useful and clarifying if one teacher of Greek may judge from his experience, and Jebb so thought in making his own abridgment of his larger edition of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*; it was an example to follow. One teacher of Greek thinks also that to print the metrical schemes of choruses with the choruses would be a useful practice. The tune's the thing and few there be that find it. A good ear and a knack for meters make tolerable songs, but the rest were better silence; yet if the metrical schemes were under our students' eyes they might have "so sweet a breath to sing" that we should be entranced by their dulcet symphonies. From the notes we would subtract nothing yet might desire to add a little to them here and there despite the clear-cut scheme of editing. For instance, and only for instance, a few words about Procne, Itys and Philomela would be in point on l. 107, that same potential dictionary to the contrary notwithstanding; and by the same token, or despite it, a few on Niobe (150) and a few more on Iphigeneia (531). The notes on μή οὐ (107, 133) are not very satisfactory and suggest that the absence of grammar references in English editions commends their presence in American editions; they are a brief, lucid and satisfactory means of explanation and, in an increasingly grammarless and ungrammatical land, important likewise. The scholiast's remark on εἰροδοῖ' (278) is better than Jebb's and briefer, κατηρεφέι (381) invites a repetition of Jebb's interesting note on *Antigone*, 774. Expressed notes on some words—as on κύρο (919)—would be better than references to other plays. The seductive rendering, after Whitelaw, of l. 1451 is a good instance of overtranslation; the Greek words are by no means so concrete. The indexes follow the larger edition as nearly as may be. The Greek index is fairly good; ampler ones, like Holden's, are really useful. The English index is good. The front cover bears a somewhat Socratic head of Sophocles after the Lateran statue—*longo sed intervallo*; but the

cover design in general is good. The binding and paper are not up to the English average. The print, with but few exceptions, is clear and legible. All said, "the substantial matter is well forged out" and the book is a very good one; it assumes intelligence in the student, which is complimentary to the student.

It is good to have so excellent an edition of the *Electra* available for our classes. The play deserves more frequent reading among us. With Sophocles, we must take the legend—not more repellent than some others—as we find it, thankful that a ram was put in the thicket for Abraham and that later Greek legend did as much for Agamemnon, but mindful that orthodoxy made better plays at Athens, though not perhaps better rhetoric, than heterodoxy. The play itself is forward-moving and rapid from the first, and full of good lines, good passages and good scenes. The horrible business of matricide is despatched without waste of words or strokes and the best comment is Orestes's own: "All is well within the house if Apollo's oracle spake well". The concluding scene in which Aegisthus is led to his death reaches the high point of tragic irony.

UNION COLLEGE

JOHN IRA BENNETT

Livy. *Selections from the First Decade*. Edited by Omer Floyd Long, of Northwestern University, in the Lake Classical Series. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Company (1908).

This edition belongs in the series so severely criticized in an editorial in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2. 121. To those who agree with this editorial nothing more need be said, for the entire plan of the book is wrong. If, however, one believes with the editor that students should not be compelled to buy expensive editions, containing masses of material of no practical service to them, and inserted mainly to afford scholars an opportunity of 'showing their ability', such editions as this may well serve as an emphatic protest. The proper interpretation of an author to a class depends in any case largely upon the teacher, and not upon the author's display of erudition in the notes. On the other hand, the student has a right to be supplied with a text with annotations sufficient to meet his reasonable demands. The reviewer would say that this edition is rather too meager.

The Introduction (pp. 9-22) deals with Livy's life, title and scope of his works, earlier histories of Rome, Livy's sources, method and purpose, style and syntax, and is in the main well written, although one can hardly think that the author meant to call Livy's history "a work of art, conscientiously executed by the standards of the author's own day" (the italics are the reviewer's). On p. 17 one should read *were* for "was". Also on p. 19, read *disertissimus* for *dissertissimus*. The text (pp. 23-160) contains twelve selections from Book 1 (about two-

thirds of the book), four each from Books 2 and 3, one each from Books 5 and 7, and two from Book 9. The book is prefaced by two maps, one of Central Italy, and one of the 'Servian City'. The notes are on the same page with the text. The printing is attractive and the proofreading good.

WILBER J. GREER

WASHBURN COLLEGE, Topeka, Kansas

## CORRESPONDENCE

My attention has been drawn to two editorials in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 2. 121, 129, containing a criticism of my editorial in *The Classical Journal* 2. 1, and of my edition of the *Phormio*. As the remarks made seem to me likely to give a wrong impression to those who do not remember the editorial in question and who have not seen the *Phormio*, I should like to say a few words on the points raised.

In the first place, I did not in any way criticize or reflect upon the scholarship of the editors of the two text books which I reviewed. So far as I knew the books were not open to criticism along that line. I did not examine them from that point of view; to prevent the possibility of confusing issues I assumed that the information contained in them was sound and accurate, nor have I ever had any reason to doubt the correctness of my assumption. What I attacked was the class of college text books which they represented and my criticism was based on the conviction that the books were wholly inappropriate for the students for whom they were ostensibly intended. That Professor Lodge has often heard these books highly commended does not surprise me in the least. I also have heard them commended, but never for their qualities as text books.

With regard to my edition of the *Phormio*, Professor Lodge intimates that I probably spent two weeks or even less time on it. Some aspects of this remark I do not care to discuss. All I wish to say is that the question of time is not germane to the issue. It does not make a particle of difference whether an editor spends five years or two years or a month in the preparation of his book, or whether he compiles it in *hora stans pede in uno*. There is but one test by which the book should stand or fall: does it meet the needs of the class of students for whom it is written? This brings us at once to the question, what assistance should be given to the average freshman—not the weakest or the strongest, but the average—reading Terence for the first time, in order to enable him to prepare his recitation in a reasonably satisfactory manner? Such a student's needs can be roughly summarized under four heads:

(1) He will find in the play a number of passages, the translation of which will be beyond his powers and equipment. These should be trans-

lated by the editor. If the student does not get this assistance from his text book he will resort to the regular use of a translation for the whole play. I have not the slightest doubt that the use of translations among college students to-day has been enormously increased by the small amount of translation furnished by a majority of the current editions. To take the position that the amount of translation which I have given robs the aggrieved and suffering student of a well merited opportunity for mental discipline, is to blind one's self to the actual facts of the case.

(2) Many forms will occur which he has never seen before. These should be explained, but in the briefest compass. Only enough should be said to enable him to connect the form commented on with the classical form with which he is familiar.

(3) Notes on metrical points should be confined to irregularities in the common meters only. In these cases the proper scansion should be indicated. Since publishing the edition I have almost concluded that I should have confined notes of this kind to the iambic senarius. I doubt very much whether it is wise to attempt to teach more than this meter to freshmen reading their first Roman comedy. It is better that a student should be able to read one meter intelligently than that he should be able to write out the scansion of a whole play.

(4) References in the text to persons, places, historical events or national customs should be confined to a few words or lines, only enough being given to make the context clear.

But such an edition, it is urged, furnishes "meager pabulum". It is slight, of course, but it is intended to be slight. To criticize it for what has been deliberately excluded is to fail to see the guiding principle of the whole plan, namely that detailed discussion of points occurring in the text, whether they are points of meter, syntax, morphology, history, customs or literary style, is best left to the instructor. He knows better than any editor what the possibilities of his students are, and can adapt his instruction to them. The real battle-ground is the classroom, not the text book. Far from decrying American scholarship, I have assumed in my edition that the instructors in our colleges are in a position to give such information as is desirable as well or better than I could, and their treatment of the various points will have the great advantage of being *viva voce* instruction. The college text book of to-day, it has often seemed to me, aims chiefly at the elimination of the instructor.

But, it is said, the material contained in one of these elaborate text books does not do the student any harm and makes the edition useful as a book of reference. This is so only to a very limited extent. As I heard a good scholar and practical teacher state the case the other day, these editions

fall between two stools: they contain much that is of no service to the student, but do not contain enough to rank as substantial works of reference. When I spoke of comprehensive editions intended for advanced students and instructors I had in mind such works as Furneaux's *Annals of Tacitus*, and Tyrrell's edition of *Cicero's Letters*. But these, it will be said at once, are English publications; an American publishing house would not accept commentaries of such size. I do not believe that this is an accurate statement of the case. American publishers fully appreciate the prestige which a large standard edition gives to their list of publications. They will accept such a book even when they know that it will be a long time before they get back the money they put into it. Further, it does not seem to be fully realized in all quarters that as a direct result of the greatly increased endowments of colleges and libraries the market for standard works of all kinds has vastly improved in America in the last ten or fifteen years. The library sale alone will now go far toward meeting the cost of production of a book that at an earlier period would have been a dead loss. Again, if publishers still show hesitation in accepting large editions, the editors of our numerous series are largely to blame for the situation. Series should be so organized as to include besides the school and college text books, a few standard editions. Apart from that pride in their list of publications, which I believe has far more influence than is usually recognized, publishers would accept the larger works for the sake of the profits of the smaller. This plan, it seems to me, is not only practicable, but in every way superior to the present system with its misapplied erudition in the individual books and its futile duplication in the various series.

Finally, it does not seem to me likely that very many will agree with Professor Lodge that these text books afford a valuable medium for the publication of the results of American scholarship and research. The men who belong to the first class of American classical scholars have not attained that position by writing text books. As a matter of fact, the multiplication of text books has indirectly retarded the progress of classical scholarship in this country, for it has diverted from the higher branches of research the energies of many men who are in a position to do work of an advanced grade. This is one of the points that I endeavored to make in my editorial in *The Classical Journal*: "The editors are, for the most part, men who have proved the soundness of their scholarship by their university records, by their writings in the journals and in other ways. Why, then, should they, competent and highly trained, spend their time upon books, which although they require an enormous



amount of labor, serve no useful purpose"? That the making of these books does take a large amount of time cannot be doubted. It is a fact which even I, with my fatal habit of writing a text book in two weeks or less, can dimly discern. G. J. LAING

CHICAGO UNIVERSITY

### LATIN VERSIONS

#### TO — WITH A ROSE

I asked my heart to say  
Some words whose worth my love's devoir might pay  
Upon my Lady's natal day.  
Then said my heart to me,  
*Learn from the rhyme that now shall come to thee*  
*What fits thy love most lovingly!*  
This gift that learning shows,  
For as a rhyme with its rhyme-twin goes  
I send a rose unto a Rose! —SIDNEY LANIER

#### APOPHORETA

"Dic mihi, cor, quali verbo nunc scribere possim,  
quantus amor mihi sit, si modo dicere fas!  
fer dominae munus, natali luce serena".  
Haec ego sic animo sic animusque dedit:  
"Parvo fasciculo versus quos misi in eodem,  
te quid, Amor, deceat, fantur, amata, tibi".  
Namque simul donum mea docta puella resignat,  
en versus gemini! bella Rosaeque rosa!

#### TEMPERAMENT

Alas! that hidden habit in t'he blood  
Baffling the will that would eradicate!  
Elusive as an eel that lurks in mud  
To snap out sudden at the Tempter's bait.  
—HENRY AUSTEN

#### UNUS UTRIQUE ERROR

Heu, istum, miserum esse occultum in sanguine  
morem!  
quod volo non facio, nescio quidquid agam,  
lubricus ut conger luteis submersus in undis  
escam qui subito mordicus usque petit.

#### FROM "A CHRISTMAS SERMON"

To be honest, to be kind—to earn a little and to spend a little less, to make upon the whole a family happier for his presence, to renounce when that shall be necessary and not be embittered, to keep a few friends, but these without capitulation—above all, on the same grim condition, to keep friends with himself—here is a task for all that a man has of fortitude and delicacy. —R. L. STEVENSON

#### HAEC EGO MECUM

Qui didicit vitam moderatam degere norma  
inque dies rebus parcere sponte suis,

vivere qui voluit melius, qui dulcis amicis,  
non sibi verum aliis, hoc aliterque libens,  
contentus paucos servare tenereque amicos  
(sit sibi conveniens), hic sapiens vir erit.

#### DIRGE

If thou wilt ease thine heart  
Of love and all its smart,  
Then sleep, dear, sleep,  
And not a sorrow  
Hang any tear on your eyelashes;  
Lie still and deep,  
Sad soul, until the sea-wave washes  
The rim o' the sun to-morrow,  
In eastern sky.

But wilt thou cure thine heart  
Of love and all its smart,  
Then die, dear, die,  
'Tis deeper, sweeter,  
Than on a rose bank to lie dreaming  
With folded eye;  
And then alone, amid the beaming  
Of love's stars, thou'lt meet her  
In eastern sky.

—THOMAS LOVELL BEDDOES

#### NENIA

Mentem levare si cupias tuam  
sic, care, tu dormi, quiesce,  
amore acerbo et tristitia gravi,  
nec lacrimis oculi madescant.  
Quiesce, maestum cor gravidum malis,  
donec lavetur margine posterus  
undis marinis in sereno  
sol, oriente polo et corusco.  
Mentis mederi si cupias tamen  
amori acerbo et tristitiae gravi,  
morti succumbas, care, morti—  
dulcius est nimio altiusque  
quam somnians ut subiaceas rosis  
multis, opertis luminibus tuis—  
vires tum amoris solus inter  
astra oriente polo puellam.

—GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

I trust I may be allowed to revert to my remarks in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 2. 169 on the use of *nec*, *neque* in commands or wishes after positive expressions, partly to correct a misprint (for Hale-Buck 464. 1. 2 read 464. 1 b), partly to add a reference to a discussion of certain uses of *neque* and *neve*, by Dr. E. B. Lease, in Classical Philology, volume 3, especially pages 308 ff., partly to ask pardon for the sad lapse by which Schmalz twice appears as Schanz. C. K.

## THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is published by The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. It is issued weekly, on Saturdays, from October to May inclusive, except in weeks in which there is a legal or school holiday, at Teachers College, 525 West 120th Street, New York City.

All persons within the territory of the Association who are interested in the literature, the life and the art of ancient Greece and ancient Rome, whether actually engaged in teaching the Classics or not, are eligible to membership in the Association. Application for membership may be made to the Secretary-Treasurer, Charles Knapp, Barnard College, New York. The annual dues (which cover also the subscription to THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY), are two dollars. Within the territory covered by the Association (New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, District of Columbia, Virginia) subscription is possible to individuals only through membership. To institutions in this territory the subscription price is one dollar per year.

To persons outside the territory of the Association the subscription price of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is one dollar per year.

THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is conducted by the following board of editors:

### Editor-in-Chief

GONZALEZ LODGE, Teachers College, New York

### Associate Editors

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College

ERNEST RIESS, Boys' High School, Brooklyn

MITCHELL CARROLL, The George Washington University

HARRY L. WILSON, Johns Hopkins University

### Business Manager

CHARLES KNAPP, Barnard College, New York City

Communications, articles, reviews, queries, etc., should be sent to the editor-in-chief. Inquiries concerning subscriptions and advertising, back numbers or extra numbers, notices of change of address, etc., should be sent to the business manager.

## Columbia University Summer Session

July 7—Aug. 18, 1909.

### COURSES IN GREEK.

Elementary Course. Associate Professor Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College.

Plato, The Gorgias and Phaedo. Associate Professor Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College.

Homer, Iliad and Odyssey. Associate Professor Grace H. Macurdy, Vassar College.

### COURSES IN GREEK ART.

History of Greek Art. Professor Oliver S. Tonks, Princeton University.

Greek Sculpture. Professor Oliver S. Tonks, Princeton University.

### COURSES IN LATIN.

Prose Composition. Professor Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University.

Suetonius. Selected Lives. Professor John C. Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania.

The Satires of Juvenal. Professor Harry L. Wilson, Johns Hopkins University.

Vergil's Aeneid, Books II and VI. Professor Nelson G. McCrea, Columbia University.

History of Roman Literature. Professor John C. Rolfe, University of Pennsylvania.

Latin Inscriptions. Professor Harry L. Wilson, Johns Hopkins University.

## Caesar's Gallic War

By W. B. GUNNISON & W. H. HARLEY, Erasmus Hall High School.

All the text, grammar and composition needed for second year work; convenient, practical, economical. \$1.25.

### THE FIRST YEAR OF LATIN

By the same authors; a preparation for Caesar. \$1.00.

SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY

NEW YORK BOSTON CHICAGO

## A Noteworthy Adoption

On March 22, 1909, the School Committee of the City of Boston authorized Pearson's Essentials of Latin for Beginners for use in all the High and Latin Schools of the city.

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY, Publishers

## COLLEGE SERIES OF GREEK AND LATIN AUTHORS

Every book edited by an eminent scholar	
Some of the Latin Authors	Some of the Greek Authors
CATULLUS	AESCHYLUS
CICERO	HOMER
HORACE	EURIPIDES
JUVENAL	LUCIAN
LIVY	LYSIAS
PLAUTUS	PAUSANIAS
TACITUS	PLATO
	THUCYDIDES
	XENOPHON

## GINN AND COMPANY, Publishers

BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO LONDON

## BEGINNING LATIN

By J. EDMUND BARSS

HOTCHKISS SCHOOL, LAKEVILLE, CONN.

The constructive method employed in the treatment of inflections arouses the pupil's interest by saying, "Here are certain things; build with them after such a fashion", instead of "Here is a list; remember it".

The book secures (1) mastery of forms; (2) the nucleus of a working vocabulary; (3) a grasp of the broad principles of the Latin sentence.

Every fifth lesson is a Latin reading lesson. The principles of elementary syntax and of sentence structure are amply illustrated in the reading lessons and in the exercises.

3 Cloth, 352 pages, \$1.00. ♣ ♣

D. C. HEATH & CO., Publishers  
BOSTON NEW YORK CHICAGO

## HIGH SCHOOL COURSE IN LATIN COMPOSITION

By CHARLES MCCOY BAKER, Horace Mann School, Teachers College, and ALEXANDER JAMES INGLIS, Horace Mann School, Teachers College. 12 mo. Cloth. xiii + 463 pages. \$1.00 net.

This book consists of three parts arranged for practice in writing Latin during the last three years of school, and, in addition, a summary of the Elements of Syntax for reference.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY  
64-66 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK

## Virgil Aeneid Books I-VI

By H. R. FAIRCLOUGH, Professor of Latin, Leland Stanford Junior University, and SELDON L. BROWN, Principal of Wellesley Mass. High School. pp. lxi + 515 + 140 1908.

Read the review of this book in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY of Dec. 12, 1908.

BENJ. H. SANBORN & CO.  
Boston New York Chicago London